

## Interview Summary

An interview was held with examiner on 14 May 2010. Proposed claims and arguments were presented. As discussed with the examiner, in light of the rejections in the most recent office action, the applicant proposes reverting back to the originally presented claims and making amendments thereto. (The claims are presented as new claims in the present amendment). As the examiner mentions in the Office Action, new claim 12 broadened the scope of the invention, such that the examiner's position concerning allowability in the Office Action of 04/09/2009 was no longer relevant. The examiner agreed that the proposed claims appeared to distinguish over the cited art as previously stated in the Office Action of 04/09/2008, but that the search would need to be updated.

## REMARKS

New claims 23 - 30 are presented that are based upon the originally presented claims, but amended to correct the issues of indefiniteness objected to by the examiner in the Office Action of 04/09/2008, while attempting to retain the limitations and scope of the original claims. The new claims are thus believed to maintain the structural features that appear to have led the examiner to feel that the claim distinguishes over the cited art.

In that connection it is noted that Churchill (US 5713773) discloses an inflatable device made of a flexible material that lacks the steering ribs, runners and other claimed structural features that are described in the specification as providing the device with stability and steerability on both water and snow. Churchill, being merely an inflatable device without such steering members, would not exhibit those characteristics on a snow surface. The present invention, on the other hand, is comprised of a top and a bottom "board" having particularly described steering ridges, grooves, side faces and steering runners that are not taught by Churchill or the other cited art. The present invention comprises an air bag mounted in a depression in the top board, a feature not present in Churchill, as Churchill is not made of "boards".

To further distinguish the invention from Churchill, it is noted that the term "board" as used in the present disclosure implies that those boards are rigid. Churchill on the other hand is made of a flexible inflatable material. This is supported in the specification by the fact that these structures are, in the first instance, described as "boards", which is generally

understood by one skilled in the art to imply rigidity. Furthermore, at page 5, line 25 the boards are describes as being "riveted" together. This, combined with the illustration of the boards in the figures, would lead one skilled in the art to clearly understand that the boards are rigid, in contrast to an inflatable, flexible material. In addition, the applicant distinguishes inflatable prior art devices of the type shown in Churchill at page 1, the clear implication being that the present invention is not merely made of an inflatable flexible material.

While claim 24 is believed patentable at least based on its dependence from claim 23, claim 24 further adds the feature of openings leading into the hollow space between the boards. (in order to fill the space with water to make the device sit lower in the water). As Churchill is an inflatable device, it of course cannot have openings leading to its hollow interior.